



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/025,807	12/18/2001	Todd Wostrel	TI-32597	6004
23494	7590	05/05/2004	EXAMINER	
TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED			ARNOLD, ADAM	
P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999			ART UNIT	
DALLAS, TX 75265			PAPER NUMBER	
			2671	

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2004

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/025,807

Applicant(s)

WOSTREL, TODD

Examiner

Adam Arnold

Art Unit

2671

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 February 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The examiner acknowledges the receipt and entry of the applicant's amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett, U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2002/0140734 A1. Referring to claim 1, Bennett discloses a software program stored on a computer media (paragraph 107, lines 1-8) which provides a user interface for the computing device (paragraph 236, lines 1-9) comprising a display grid having rows and columns of cells (paragraph 188, lines 1-5) a number displayed in a plurality of the cells (paragraph 248, line 12) on a plurality of adjacent rows and columns (see Figure 4, where 100.00 is displayed on 2 adjacent rows and Figure 1, where 1.00 is displayed on 2 adjacent columns) and where the numbers displayed in the cells are updated under software control and represent a common property which changes according to an algorithm set by a user (see paragraph 183, where "quantity" can be considered a "property" of an object). Bennett does not disclose a handheld computer device although it does disclose combining a calculator program with the functionality of a spreadsheet (paragraph 29). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art replace a handheld computer device for a

calculator. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because the terms are synonymous.

Referring to claim 2, Bennett discloses the software program of claim 1 further comprising a cursor operable by the user which indicates at least one currently selected cell (paragraph 191, lines 1-4).

Referring to claim 3, Bennett does not disclose where the cursor is a dashed cell outline although it does disclose that a black box or “many other techniques” may be deployed to identify the cursor (paragraph 191). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to represent the cursor with a dashed cell outline. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this in order to provide the user with a focus for the selected cell.

Referring to claim 4, Bennett discloses allowing the user to set at least one cell to a fixed value (paragraph 182, line 9).

Referring to claim 5, Bennett discloses allowing the user to adjust the value of a cursor selected cell up or down while the software is changing the numbers in the cells according to the algorithm (see paragraph 172 where Bennett provides for the modification of fields).

Referring to claim 6, the remarks presented above with respect to claims 3 and 4 apply equally to this claim.

Referring to claim 7, the remarks presented above with respect to claim 5 apply equally to this claim.

Referring to claim 8, Bennett does not specifically disclose where the software is programmed to provide a heat transfer lab simulation environment. However, since the heat

Art Unit: 2671

transfer simulation is merely a mathematical calculation, it can be implemented under Bennett (see paragraph 183 which provides for mathematical calculations).

Referring to claim 9, the remarks presented above with respect to claim 1 apply equally to this claim. In addition, Bennett discloses a screen, input device and a processor (paragraph 104).

Referring to claim 10, the remarks presented above with respect to claim 2 apply equally to this claim.

Referring to claim 11, the remarks presented above with respect to claim 3 apply equally to this claim.

Referring to claim 12, the remarks presented above with respect to claim 4 apply equally to this claim.

Referring to claim 13, the remarks presented above with respect to claim 5 apply equally to this claim.

Referring to claim 14, the remarks presented above with respect to claim 6 apply equally to this claim.

Referring to claim 15, the remarks presented above with respect to claim 5 apply equally to this claim.

Referring to claim 16, the remarks presented above with respect to claim 9 apply equally to this claim.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed February 17, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The gist of the applicant's argument appears to be that Bennet does not deal with common "properties" on adjacent rows and columns. This argument has been sufficiently dealt with in the claim 1 rejection above. The applicant also refers to other issues such as entering real-time data, temperature and population. These are not part of the claim 1 as amended and will not be discussed.

The rejections to these claims stand.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Adam Arnold** whose telephone number is **703-305-8413**. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays between 7:00 AM and 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Zimmerman, can be reached at (703) 305-9798.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.



MARK ZIMMERMAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600